

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11-13 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent application publication no. 2004/0019913 of Wong et al. ("Wong").

Claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Wong. Claims 3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Wong in view of U.S. Patent no.

6,721,957 of Lawrence ("Lawrence"). Claims 15-17, 23, 24 and 26-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Wong in view of U.S. Patent application publication no. 2001/0005380 of Weis ("Weis"). Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Wong in view of Weis and further in view of Lawrence.

Summary of Amendments

No claims have been canceled. Claims 1, 6-10, 13, 16-18 and 21-23 have been amended. Claims 33-39 are newly added. No new matter has been added.

The abstract has been replaced.

Objection to Specification

The abstract has been replaced in response to the Examiner's objection. The objection is thought to be overcome.

Discussion of Rejections

New claim 37 recites:

37. (New) A method comprising:
receiving **concurrently**, in a digital audio/video receiver system, **a plurality of transport streams which have a plurality of different formats**, each transport stream including a plurality of packets;
creating an aggregate transport stream **in a single format** from the plurality of transport streams in said digital audio/video receiver system; and
storing the aggregate transport stream in a memory for use by subsequent decode and display operations.
(Emphasis added.)

The cited art does not disclose or suggest such a method or a corresponding apparatus. Wong discloses a system-on-a-chip for use in an interactive broadband set-top box. The disclosed system is mainly directed toward enabling the chip to interface with either a PCMCIA peripheral device or a POD peripheral device, and to automatically detect the type of peripheral device to which the chip is interfaced (see para. [0012]). As disclosed, the system of Wong can process a digital transport stream.

However, Wong does not disclose or suggest that the system can *concurrently* receive a plurality of transport streams that have *a plurality of different formats*, aggregate them *into a single format*, and then store the aggregate transport stream in a memory for use by subsequent decode and display operations. Nor does Wong provide any motivation or suggestion as to why that would be desirable. Likewise, the other cited references are not seen to disclose or suggest such functionality. For at least this reason, therefore, claim 37 and all claims which depend on it are believed to be patentable over the cited art.

It is noted that, regarding the rejection of dependent claim 11 (Office Action, p. 11.), the Examiner cites Wong at paragraphs [0044] – [0045] as allegedly disclosing an aggregate transport stream which includes data obtained from *different protocol*

standards. The cited disclosure in Wong actually relates to other types of cards, i.e., *other than PCMCIA or POD*, that may be the installed card. However, the system in Wong, as disclosed, still can only accommodate *one card at a time* (a PCMCIA, a POD, or some alternative). Therefore, the system in Wong, as disclosed, has no capability to *concurrently* receive signals from more than one type of card, or to receive transport streams in a plurality of different formats as recited in claim 37, nor is such capability suggested in Wong.

Each of the other independent claims in the present application also includes limitations similar to those of claim 37 mentioned above. Therefore, each of the other independent claims and all claims which depend on them are patentable over the cited art at least for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Further regarding independent claim 23, the Examiner admits that Wong fails to disclose a *switching matrix* to receive the plurality of transport streams and to output a programmable subset of the plurality of transport streams. However, the Examiner contends that Weis discloses a switching matrix, and that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Weis with those of Wong “in order to switch between streams so ‘incoming information streams can be forwarded from each port of an input module to each port of an output module’ [See 0003]” (Office Action, p. 11). However, this alleged motivation to make the combination does not withstand scrutiny.

The system of Wong does not have the sort of architecture that would benefit from a switching matrix such as disclosed in Weis, i.e., an architecture with a plurality of

similar input ports and a plurality of similar output ports. A switching matrix would not be advantageous in a system of the type disclosed in Wong, and in fact, it is unclear how the system in Wong could even operate for its intended purpose if it incorporated a switching matrix. Therefore, irrespective of the arguments presented above, the rejection of claim 23 is improper for this additional reason, i.e., because no legitimate motivation/suggestion to combine the cited references has been shown.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April 9, 2007



Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602